

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 16-22, 25-27 and 31-59 are currently pending in this application. Claims 8-9, 13-15, 23-24 and 28-30 have been cancelled. Applicant has amended claims 1-7, 10-12, 16-22 and 25-27. Applicant has added new claims 31-59 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. No new matter has been introduced by way of these amendments.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,061,349 issued to Coile, et al. (hereinafter "Coile"). In the alternative, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Coile.

The Examiner asserts that the Local Director 200 illustrated in Figures 2-4 of Coile corresponds to Applicant's claimed devices. The Local Director 200 of Coile becomes a bottleneck, as all packets transmitted in either direction between clients and the servers in the server farm must pass through the local director 200. In contrast, in accordance with the Applicant's claimed techniques, a response to a migrated client request need not return through a server or computing device that migrated the request. The Local Director 200 of Coile does not have "an application" as recited. Thus, Coile's switch Local Director 200 cannot possibly teach, suggest, or motivate the computing device or server recited by Applicant's claims.


Turning to the language of the claims, each of the independent claims recite aspects nowhere found in the Local Director 200 of Coile. Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, a "a first computing device configured to ... bind the data structure ... to an application of the first computing device." Independent claims 4, 10, 19 and 25, as amended, recite, "an application of the first computing device." Independent claim 16, as amended, recites, "to an application of the first server." New independent claim 49 recites, "controlling a processor of a first server ... a connection endpoint bound to ... an application of the first server," and new independent claim 53 recites, "controlling a processor of a first server ... an application of the first server." New independent claim 58 recites "A first server, comprising ... a module configured to selectively bind the data

structure associated with the connection to the client to an application of the first server.”
Local Director 200 of Coile does not have “an application” as claimed.

Therefore, for these reasons and others, since Coile does not teach, suggest, or motivate one or more elements or acts of each of Applicant’s claims 1-7, 10-12, 16-22, 25-27 and 31-59, Applicant’s claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Coile. In the event the Examiner disagrees or finds minor informalities, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview to discuss the Examiner’s issues and to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Accompanying this Amendment is a Request for Telephone Interview in the event the Examiner does not agree that the claims are allowable over the cited references.

In closing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter these amendments and to reconsider this application and its early allowance. The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC


Timothy L. Boller
Registration No. 47,435

TLB:rg

Enclosures:
Postcard
Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

700135.433/575354v1